After Chartism

Class and nation in English radical politics, 1848–1874

MARGOT C. FINN
Assistant Professor of History, Emory University

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

PUBLISHED BY THE PRESS SYNDICATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE
The Pitt Building, Trumpington Street, Cambridge, United Kingdom

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 2RU, UK
40 West 20th Street, New York NY 10011–4211, USA
477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia
Ruiz de Alarcón 13, 28014 Madrid, Spain
Dock House, The Waterfront, Cape Town 8001, South Africa

http://www.cambridge.org

First published 1993
First paperback edition 2002

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication data
Finn, Margot C.
After Chartism: class and nation in English radical politics,
1848–1874 / Margot C. Finn.
p. cm. – (Past and present publications)
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 0 521 40496 7
1. Radicalism – England – History – 19th century. 2. Working class –
England – Political activity – History – 19th century. 3. Middle
classes – England – Political activity – History – 19th century.
I. Title. II. Series.
HN400.R3F56 1993
322'.2'094209034–dc20 92-30241 CIP

ISBN 0 521 40496 7 hardback
ISBN 0 521 52598 5 paperback

Contents

Illustrations

Introduction

It is a truism, indeed it is a platitude, of Victorian labour history that the years which bridged the late Chartist movement and early socialism witnessed a fundamental discontinuity in the political development of the English working class. Upheld by Marx in the early nineteenth century as the harbinger of world revolution, English labour radicalism was denounced by Lenin in the early twentieth century as the captive of atavistic reformism. The intervening years saw not proletarian revolution but rather accommodation with a middle class itself bereft of true class consciousness. Thus 'a supine bourgeoisie', in a much-quoted phrase, 'produced a subordinate proletariat'. In doing so, some writers argue, it established a pattern of meliorist inter-class relations that has governed British political life to the present day.[1]

Painstakingly anatomized and trenchantly denounced by the editorial vanguard of the *New Left Review* from 1964, the 'profound caesura' of class politics in mid-Victorian England has, in the past three decades, become a basic premise of historical writing within the British left. Standing in sharp contrast to 'the great political ferment of 1815–48' and 'the continuous development of the modern labour movement and Labour Party ... with the rediscovery of socialism and the so-called "new" unionism of the 1880s', Eric Hobsbawm argues, 'the intervening decades were unlike either what went before or what came after'.[2] The defining characteristics of

[1] Perry Anderson, 'Origins of the Present Crisis', *New Left Review*, no. 23 (January-February 1964), pp. 26–51, citation from p. 36.

[2] Eric Hobsbawm, 'The Formation of British Working-Class Culture', in his *Worlds of Labour: Further Studies in the History of Labour* (London, 1984), p. 182. 'Profound caesura' is Anderson's phrase in 'Origins of the Present Crisis', p. 33. For a broader introduction to the polemics that surround this issue, see Perry Anderson's *Arguments within English Marxism* (London, 1980), and E.P. Thomp-

these years – the triumph of liberal economics, the growth of political reformism, and the diminution of social protest – are, however, more often invoked as established verities than explored as historical problems. Far more profound than the putative caesura engendered by the downtrodden (or insipid) force of English labour is the historiographical caesura of the mid-Victorian period, the dearth of scholarship which attempts to sketch the contours – much less to probe the mechanisms – of social conflict and conciliation in mid-Victorian England. E.P. Thompson has chronicled the growth of working-class militancy to 1832 at great length; Hobsbawm and others detail its renewed development from the 1870s.[3] Studies of Chartism abound; the secondary literature of late Victorian socialism is vast. A different logic governs the historiography of the intervening decades. For despite its pivotal role in the dominant theories of the discipline, the history of mid-Victorian working-class politics remains largely unwritten.[4]

Historians who employ the so-called labour aristocracy thesis to examine the social consensus of these years have offered a signal exception to this general rule of historiographical absence. Since the publication of Royden Harrison's *Before the Socialists* in 1965, the bulk of substantive inquiry into the post-Chartist era has followed this path.[5] Intent to underscore the divisions within labour that

son, 'The Peculiarities of the English', in Ralph Miliband and John Saville (eds.), *The Socialist Register: 1965* (London, 1965), pp. 311–62.

[3] E.P. Thompson, *The Making of the English Working Class* (Harmondsworth, 1963); Eric Hobsbawm, 'The Making of the Working Class 1870–1914', in his *Worlds of Labour*, pp. 194–213; Gareth Stedman Jones, 'Working-Class Culture and Working-Class Politics in London, 1870–1900: Notes on the Remaking of a Working Class', in his *Languages of Class: Studies in English Working Class History 1832–1982* (Cambridge, 1983), pp. 179–238.

[4] See the persuasive argument along these lines in Christopher Kent, 'Presence and Absence: History, Theory, and the Working Class', *Victorian Studies*, vol. 29 (Spring 1986), pp. 437–62. Three fine exceptions to this general rule of neglect which do not figure in the historiography of the labour aristocracy debate discussed below are Brian Harrison and Patricia Hollis, 'Chartism, Liberalism and the Life of Robert Lowery', *English Historical Review*, vol. 82 (July 1967), pp. 503–35; Martin Hewitt, 'Radicalism and the Victorian Working Class: The Case of Samuel Bamford', *Historical Journal*, vol. 34 (December 1991), pp. 873–92; and Stan Shipley, *Club Life and Socialism in Mid-Victorian London* (Oxford, 1971). See also the suggestive arguments of Harold Perkin, *The Origins of Modern English Society* (London, 1969).

[5] Royden Harrison, *Before the Socialists: Studies in Labour and Politics, 1861–1881* (London, 1965). Among the studies of the period that employ this basic framework, the most significant are Geoffrey Crossick, *An Artisan Elite in Victorian Society: Kentish London 1840–1880* (London, 1978); Robert Q. Gray, *The Labour Aristoc-*

militated against the development or expression of mature class consciousness, adherents of this broad school of analysis emphasize the strategic importance of a vocal, relatively secure labour élite situated from the 1850s at the interface between the working and the middle class. Skilled artisans located in trades largely untouched by mechanization and industrial pacemakers who occupied the higher echelons of the factory work force provide the pillars of labour aristocracy theory, forming a privileged stratum within the working class noted (if only in historical literature) for adherence to notions of independence and respectability that tied its value systems to those of the bourgeoisie, and thus deprived less affluent workers of a militant, class-conscious leadership capable of waging war against capital.[6] In its most orthodox interpretation, the labour aristocracy thesis directly links the social and economic fragmentation of the English factory proletariat to the political reformism of the wider English working class. Thus in John Foster's analysis, the sectional groupings and attendant false consciousness engendered by the industrial production process itself – most significantly by subcontracting and pacemaking – acted 'to obscure the reality of exploitation' and provide 'a ready channel for the penetration of ruling class attitudes and controls', thereby serving 'as a major prop to capitalist stability'.[7]

Social historians have subjected the claims of labour aristocracy theory to vigorous criticism, effectively demolishing the causal link that it posits between political reformism and the sectional divisions that separated labour aristocrats from labourers.[8] Recent trends in economic history, which underline the halting and piecemeal evolution of the British economy rather than its rapid industrial transformation, undercut those versions of the labour aristocracy thesis that

racy in Victorian Edinburgh (Oxford, 1976); and F.M. Leventhal, *Respectable Radical: George Howell and Victorian Working Class Politics* (Cambridge, Mass., 1971).

[6] Eric Hobsbawm, 'The Labour Aristocracy in Nineteenth-Century Britain', in his *Labouring Men: Studies in the History of Labour* (London, 1964), provides the most articulate and influential exposition of the argument; *idem*, 'The Aristocracy of Labour Reconsidered', in his *Worlds of Labour*, pp. 227–51, offers more recent reflections on this theme.

[7] John Foster, *Class Struggle and the Industrial Revolution: Early Industrial Capitalism in Three English Towns* (2nd edn, London, 1977), p. 4–5.

[8] See esp. Stedman Jones, 'Class Struggle and the Industrial Revolution', in his *Languages of Class*, pp. 25–75, and H.F. Moorhouse, 'The Marxist Theory of the Labour Aristocracy', *Social History*, vol. 3 (January 1978), pp. 61–82.

emphasize the instrumentality of factory production in the stabilization of class relations. Even within factory production, patterns of gender segregation, the retention of paternalist practices, and the escalation of ethnic tensions with the Irish now appear to have played a more significant role in the segmentation of the English work force than did the formation of a stable aristocracy of labour.[9] Variants of the labour aristocracy thesis that focus on skilled artisans rather than factory workers have similarly proven problematic, not least because skilled workers – far from consistently promoting political and industrial quiescence – typically stood at the forefront of Victorian radical movements. Reflecting social aspirations and cultural preferences that departed from the characteristic preoccupations of the employing class, the notions of thrift, respectability, and independence that informed the behaviour of many of these artisans are now seen to have represented values distinct to their station, rather than emblems of their embourgeoisement.[10]

Although historians have largely discarded the labour aristocracy thesis as a satisfactory blueprint for the analysis of mid-Victorian politics and social relations, their efforts to dismantle the theory's explanatory structures have done little to challenge its central contention that the years between Chartism and early socialism witnessed the liberalization of labour, the displacement of early class consciousness by a worldview that accepted the overarching framework of liberal economic mechanisms in the market and Liberal party politics in Parliament. Indeed, as scholars of the working class have turned away from essentially economic approaches to class

[9] N.F.R. Crafts, *British Economic Growth during the Industrial Revolution* (Oxford, 1985), and Raphael Samuel, 'The Workshop of the World: Steam Power and Hand Technology in Mid-Victorian Britain', *History Workshop Journal*, no. 3 (Spring 1977), pp. 6–72, detail the limits of Britain's industrial transformation. Patrick Joyce, *Work, Society and Politics: The Culture of the Factory in Later Victorian England* (Brighton, 1980), and Neville Kirk, *The Growth of Working Class Reformism in Mid-Victorian England* (London, 1985), emphasize the significance of ethnic barriers, family formations, and gender.

[10] For the contribution of skilled workers to radical politics and industrial struggles, see John Breuilly, 'Artisan Economy, Artisan Politics, Artisan Ideology: The Artisan Contribution to the 19th Century European Labour Movement', in Clive Emsley and James Walvin (eds.), *Artisans, Peasants and Proletarians 1760–1860* (London, 1985), pp. 187–225. The multi-valence of notions such as independence is ably demonstrated in Peter Bailey, '"Will the Real Bill Banks Please Stand Up?": Towards a Role Analysis of Mid-Victorian Working-Class Respectability', *Journal of Social History*, vol. 12 (Spring 1979), pp. 336–53.

relations and adopted social, cultural, and political analyses in their stead, the purchase of the liberalization thesis has gained new strength. Whereas proponents of labour aristocracy theory located the origins of liberalization in a production process over which workers had little control, historians now find the seeds of liberal conviction rooted in working-class thought and speech itself. Thus Gareth Stedman Jones, in a particularly influential study of Chartist rhetoric, argues that liberal and libertarian tendencies both animated the language of Chartism and undermined the movement's ability to forge and maintain class struggle. In this view, the Chartists' preoccupation with corrupt, tyrannical, and repressive state institutions acted to distinguish their movement from bourgeois radicalism in the 1830s but promoted their incorporation within middle- and upper-class political structures in the 1840s and 1850s, when government ministers adopted liberal economic and political measures that tempered the class character of the state.[11]

This emphasis on the intersection of working-class radical culture with middle-class liberal politics – and hence on the considerable constraints placed on the development of working-class consciousness – is salutary, and fundamental to an understanding of the perception of social relations in Victorian England. For although the middle class had gained the franchise with the passage of the First Reform Act in 1832, its members remained (like the labouring population) largely excluded from the corridors of power throughout the century. Restricted to one seventh of the adult male population, concentrated disproportionately in the agricultural south, and pervaded by jobbery, intimidation, and corruption, the nineteenth-century electoral system consistently returned a House dominated by the landed and aristocratic interest. A shared abhorrence for this edifice of 'Old Corruption' linked reform-minded men of the middle and working class in the Victorian era as it had in the age of the French revolution.[12] Traditions of religious Dissent similarly acted to unite middle- and working-class reformers. Although opposition to the doctrines and perquisites of the Angli-

[11] Stedman Jones, 'Rethinking Chartism', in his *Languages of Class*, pp. 90–178. For other historians' variations on this theme of liberalization, see below, pp. 66, 238.

[12] Norman Gash, *Politics in the Age of Peel: A Study in the Technique of Parliamentary Representation 1830–1850* (London, 1953), details the persistence of landed and aristocratic rule; W.D. Rubinstein, 'The End of "Old Corruption" in Britain 1780–1860', *Past and Present*, no. 101 (November 1983), pp. 55–86, surveys its protracted demise.

can Church did not lead inevitably to oppositional political convictions, the legal disabilities suffered by Nonconformists of the middle class encouraged Dissenters to associate their cause both with the claims of the unenfranchised millions and with the fortunes of a Whig and Liberal political establishment that pledged to uphold the principles of civil and religious freedom.[13] Norms of orthography reflected these points of intersection between middle- and working-class culture. Working-class leaders, provincial manufacturers, and Nonconformists often joined in efforts to 'organize' public opinion and the 'laboring' population against the evils of a 'centralized' state; the Anglican élite, in contrast, 'organised' the resources of 'centralised' institutions such as the New Poor Law to meet the new demands of 'labour' in a commercial polity.[14]

More broadly, the burden of recent scholarship on class has underscored the extent to which shared beliefs in the legitimacy of parliamentary structures informed working-, middle-, and upper-class culture alike, containing labour's political vision securely within the compass of the nation-state. Embraced by historians who disagree deeply on the nature and meaning of class relations in England, the argument that national identities obscured or replaced class allegiances in the mid-Victorian period is now a commonplace of the literature. John Foster identified nationalist sentiment as an instrument of liberalization in his study of the labour aristocracy in Oldham, Northampton, and South Shields; Stedman Jones, while critiquing Foster's analysis of sectionalism, applauds his recognition of 'the vital role played by nationalism as an ideology capable of uniting the stratified work force on capitalist terms'.[15] Ross McKibbin's detailed exposition of the failure of Marxism to capture the allegiance of British labour similarly suggests the instrumental role of

[13] James E. Bradley, 'Whigs and Nonconformists: "Slumbering Radicalism" in English Politics, 1739–89', *Eighteenth Century Studies*, vol. 9 (1975), pp. 1–27, and Russell E. Richey, 'The Origins of British Radicalism: The Changing Rationale for Dissent', *Eighteenth Century Studies*, vol. 7 (1973–4), pp. 179–92, explore the relations between radicalism and Nonconformity. Edward Royle, *Victorian Infidels: The Origins of the British Secularist Movement 1791–1866* (Manchester, 1974), and *idem, Radicals, Secularists and Republicans: Popular Freethought in Britain, 1866–1915* (Manchester, 1980), documents the links forged between liberals, Dissenters, and artisanal radicals by shared conviction in the right to religious freedoms.

[14] For examples, see below, p. 69.

[15] Foster, *Class Struggle and the Industrial Revolution*, pp. 239–43; Stedman Jones, 'Class Struggle and the Industrial Revolution', in his *Languages of Class*, pp. 72, 74.

nationalist sentiment in combating working-class consciousness.[16] And Patrick Joyce, in a significant reevaluation of Victorian and Edwardian perceptions of labour, contrasts twentieth-century historians' preoccupation with the concept of class to contemporaries' emphasis on 'extra-proletarian identifications such as those of "people" and "nation"'.[17]

This book explores the liberalization process by tracing the national and international identities embraced by middle- and working-class English radicals in the decades that spanned the continental revolutions of 1848 and the electoral defeat of William Gladstone's Liberal government in 1874. In seeking to illuminate the contemporary meanings and impact of class in mid-Victorian England, it probes the relations between radical movements and the broader liberal culture of which these agitations ultimately formed a part, detailing the protracted evolution of English national consciousness and its interpenetration with radical traditions that stretched from the Puritan revolution to the early socialist movement. The chief concern of this endeavour is to explore the cultural and political construction of perceptions of class consciousness by radical activists, and the role played by radical, national, international, and class identities in mediating liberal popular politics after Chartism. Accepting the diminution of social and political protest in the mid-Victorian era as a given, this study does not purport to explain the origins of the phenomenon of reformism. Rather, it questions the nature and extent of liberalization in Victorian England by revealing the ways in which perceived class differences, by informing received national identities, changed the meaning of liberalism itself.

The approach adopted in this work has obvious limitations. Most problematic is the emphasis placed here on the cultural and political determination of class identity, rather than the significance of class as an economic formation. This interpretation of class privileges subjective sentiments over ostensibly objective realities, highlighting perceptions of class consciousness rather than the economic substance of class relations. It thus does little to illuminate our

[16] Ross McKibbin, 'Why Was There No Marxism in Great Britain?', in his *Ideologies of Class: Social Relations in Britain 1880–1950* (Oxford, 1990), pp. 1–41, esp. pp. 23–4.

[17] Patrick Joyce, *Visions of the People: Industrial England and the Question of Class, 1840–1914* (Cambridge, 1991), p. 11.

understanding of the workplace and the relations that obtained within the labour market between masters and their men.[18] Focusing on articulate spokesmen for the working class rather than upon the men and women whose interests they claimed to represent, this study perpetuates those conventions of historical writing that underline the role of articulate leaders and obscure the contributions of the anonymous workers who sustained their movements of social and political protest. Often themselves men of middle-class origins or education, the spokesmen for labour whose radical activities form the substance of this book must be understood to have manufactured working-class identities rather than simply to have reflected them.[19] A further limitation derives from the scope of national identity under consideration. Because uneven levels of economic development, linguistic barriers, religious differences, and distinctive legal structures lent different inflections to the radical traditions of Ireland, Scotland, and Wales, this study is narrowly concerned with the history of English national identity.[20] And because the mid-Victorian period saw a withdrawal of working-class women from the public arena of popular politics, this work is largely concerned with the aspirations and activities of English men.[21]

[18] For an intelligent analysis of the arguments against the approach to class adopted here, see *ibid.*, pp. 1–23 and *idem*, 'Work', in F.M.L. Thompson (ed.), *The Cambridge Social History of Britain 1750–1950*, 3 vols. (Cambridge, 1990), vol. II, pp. 158–68. The opposing side is best represented by James A. Epstein, 'Understanding the Cap of Liberty: Symbolic Practice and Social Conflict in Early Nineteenth-Century England', *Past and Present*, no. 122 (February 1989), pp. 75–118. The broader contours of this debate on the definition of class are surveyed in Neville Kirk, 'In Defence of Class: A Critique of Recent Revisionist Writing upon the Nineteenth-Century English Working Class', *International Review of Social History*, vol. 32 (1987), pp. 2–47.

[19] The designation of men such as Ernest Jones (a barrister) as 'working-class radical leaders' fits ill with the usage of orthodox Marxism, but has the virtue of capturing contemporary Victorian usage. It represents 'the self-description of the actors that one wishes to describe and analyze', a definition of class explored by Craig Calhoun, *The Question of Class Struggle: Social Foundations of Popular Radicalism during the Industrial Revolution* (Chicago, 1982), p. 18.

[20] This is not to deny that substantial overlap obtained among the various British national and radical identities. But the profound influence of Dissent, the radical cult of Cromwell, and the persistence of notions of 'the Englishman's birthright', discussed below, pp. 36–7, 41–6 all argue against the conflation of these national identities.

[21] For the influence of women on the course of English radicalism, see Dorothy Thompson, 'Women and Nineteenth Century Radical Politics', in Juliet Mitchell and Ann Oakley (eds.), *The Rights and Wrongs of Women* (London, 1976), pp. 112–38, and Jutta Schwarzkopf, *Women in the Chartist Movement* (New York,

The rationale informing the most significant of these analytical restrictions is developed more fully in the chapters that follow, but must be indicated briefly at the outset. Most importantly, the emphasis placed here on the cultural and political construction of class is not intended to deny or denigrate the contribution of economic determinants to class formation. The purpose of this approach is instead to demonstrate the ways in which class identities escaped the confines of the workplace and animated the wider social and political life of the Victorian nation. Nor is the emphasis placed on radical leaders intended to diminish the contributions of the men and women who underpinned their radical efforts. Rather, the role of leadership is given prominence because the records that leaders left allow a reconstruction of both the activities of working-class radical movements and the relations between these movements and middle-class radical agitations. When supplemented with documents that illuminate aspects of working- and middle-class oppositional culture, the rich collections of correspondence, the diaries, pamphlets, and autobiographies that record the efforts of radical leaders can reveal the broad patterns that governed class perceptions in the Victorian era, and the limits that constrained their expression.

This study emphasizes national and international identities both as a heuristic device and as a reflection of the dominant preoccupations of mid-Victorian radical culture. Between the revolutions of 1848 and the Paris Commune of 1871, continental Europe witnessed a succession of sporadic local uprisings and sweeping national revolutions that diverged sharply from the contemporary English experience. Informed or influenced by theories elaborated in the writings and speeches of such disparate figures as Louis Blanc, Louis Kossuth, Karl Marx, and Giuseppe Mazzini, insurgents in France, Germany, Italy, Hungary, and Poland articulated a constellation of political arguments that embraced the liberty of the individual, the sanctity of national independence, the social imperatives of the state, and the collective rights of international labour. These varied concepts and the movements they inspired enjoyed wide-ranging support in England, where they created a web of shared political interests that stretched from the working population through

1991). Trends in the wage form that helped to push women from the public and political spheres are discussed by Wally Seccombe, 'Patriarchy Stabilized: The Construction of the Male Breadwinner Wage Norm in Nineteenth-Century Britain', *Social History*, vol. 11 (January 1986), pp. 53–76.

middle-class politicians to Whig and Liberal grandees.[22] But they found a particular resonance in English radical circles. Within radical culture, this enthusiasm for continental causes, reinforced by the presence in England of thousands of exiled revolutionaries from the continent,[23] became intertwined with an indigenous debate on political economy, on the relationships among political institutions, social structures, and economic activities. Enveloped within a network of English radical traditions forged with the nation-state in the seventeenth century, these continental theories helped to inspire, regulate, and maintain the reform efforts of both middle- and working-class activists. In the nationalist and internationalist efforts of the 1860s – the Garibaldi agitations, the Anglo-Polish sympathy movement, the First International, and the suffrage movement of 1864–7 – they mobilized tens of thousands in movements of protest that spoke at once to class and patriotic identities. Although often overlapping with the concerns of Liberal party politicians, these efforts also underlined divisions among middle-class liberal reformers, and between liberal partisans and the more strident radicals of the working class. By the 1870s, contests among these varied groups over the meaning of patriotic politics had helped to transform fundamentally the character of English liberal culture.

Unlike the concept of the nation, the concepts of international brotherhood expounded in these years by English radicals lacked a secure ideological framework within which to operate. Their elaboration in the nineteenth century required the establishment of such parameters, the imaginative creation of internationalist goals, strategies, martyrs, and celebrations that could compete effectively with nationalist traditions for popular support. To a large extent, nationalism itself provided the scaffolding with which English radicals constructed these internationalist paradigms: in the varied radical agitations that exercised the nation from 1848, leaders of reform repeatedly co-opted nationalist rhetoric and institutions to

[22] For aristocratic and upper-class enthusiasm for continental causes within the Liberal party, see Ann Pottinger Saab, *Reluctant Icon: Gladstone, Bulgaria, and the Working Classes, 1856–1878* (Cambridge, Mass., 1991), and E.D. Steele, *Palmerston and Liberalism, 1855–1865* (Cambridge, 1991), esp. pp. 245–316.

[23] Bernard Porter analyses the emigration in *The Refugee Question in Mid-Victorian Politics* (Cambridge, 1979). At its peak in the early 1850s, the émigré community in England included roughly 4,500 French émigrés, a few hundred Italians, 2,500 Poles and Hungarians, and 1,300 Germans. *Ibid.*, pp. 14–15.

promote international campaigns.[24] As a well-entrenched historical tradition with bases of support in all classes, nationalism enjoyed a superior position in this ideological partnership, in which it ultimately prevailed. But the radical nationalist tradition neither dominated the dialogue entirely nor emerged from its victory unscathed.

Like internationalist concepts, the concept of class initially stood outside the English radical tradition. And like international identities, the identities of class were imagined constructions – imagined not in the sense that they lacked any material basis, but in that it required an heroic act of imagination for workers to regard their own existence primarily from their standpoint. Confronted daily by wide gradations of skill, trade unionization, wealth, status, residence, dialect, and education within their own ranks, few workers in the nineteenth century enjoyed Marx's lofty vantage point for the analysis of class relations. For just as national sentiments – despite the persistent claims of nationalist leaders – do not flow magically from shared territorial or linguistic experience, class consciousness does not spring immediately from the shared experience of economic exploitation. Like the nation, class must be inculcated. Its inculcation demands not only the creation of common platforms, visions, and voices, but the imposition or acceptance of a 'shared amnesia, a collective forgetfulness', as Ernest Gellner has written of national identity, that allows its adherents to celebrate their unanimity in the face of their conspicuous differences.[25] Endured in particularistic conditions and contexts, economic relations are not typically experienced as national or international phenomena: they require a major ideological reconfiguration to be recognized as such. In mid-Victorian England, the ritualized mechanisms by which this reconfiguration of working-class experience as working-class consciousness was accomplished drew from both indigenous and continental

[24] The use of 'nationalism' to describe these agitations offends against received historical conventions of definition, conventions most ably defended by Eric Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism since 1789: Programme, Myth, Reality* (Cambridge, 1990), esp. pp. 43–5, 101–30. The usage adopted here, in which patriotism – the term used most commonly by contemporaries – is essentially conflated with nationalism – a term that began to enter the Victorian vocabulary in *ca.* 1848 – is defended below, pp. 17–18. For Victorian uses of 'nationalism' and 'nationalist' to describe the concerns of radical patriotism, see below, pp. 154, 168.

[25] Ernest Gellner, 'Nationalism and the Two Forms of Cohesion in Complex Societies', in his *Culture, Identity, and Politics* (Cambridge, 1987), pp. 6–28, citation from p. 6. Gellner here builds upon the arguments of Ernest Renan's *Qu'est-ce qu'une nation?* (Paris, 1882).

political traditions, from both patriotic and fraternal ideologies. The common but false antithesis in historical writing between nationalism and internationalism acts to obscure the two concepts' fundamental interrelation in this process. In doing so, it masks their mutual contribution to both class formation and liberal popular politics in the industrial era.